



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

9
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,756	08/28/2001	Johann Trujillo	CR00-036	5780

23330 7590 08/06/2003

MOTOROLA, INC.
CORPORATE LAW DEPARTMENT - #56-238
3102 NORTH 56TH STREET
PHOENIX, AZ 85018

EXAMINER

RAMSEY, KENNETH J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/940,756	TRUJILLO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kenneth J. Ramsey	2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9, 10, 13 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed December 9, 2002 appears to be directed to the wrong case since 1) the subject matter does not seem pertinent and 2) the docket number on the IDS and PCT case is CR99-036 while the docket number of this application is CR00-036. A photocopy of the IDS with the examiners initials is enclosed; however, applicant should verify that the correct IDS has been filed in this application.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-19, drawn to a method for producing field emission sources, classified in class 445, subclass 51.
 - II. Claims 20-23, drawn to a field emission source, classified in class 313, subclass 309.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the plurality of high aspect ratio fibers may be made by the materially different process of aligning fibers on the substrate by chemical vapor deposition.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. During a telephone conversation with William Koch on 6/3/03 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-19. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 20-23 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Prior Art Rejections

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Choi et al, 6,538,367 (including Jin et al 6,250,984 which is incorporated by reference). Choi et al, figures 3a-3d, discloses randomly depositing a plurality of nanotubes onto a substrate by spraying and applying an electric field to orient the nanotubes in a direction perpendicular to the substrate. Choi et al, column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 5 incorporates a copending application 09/236,966, now US patent 6,250,984, and states that the substrate is preferably a conductive substrate and the nanotubes are adhere thereto as disclosed in the copending application, i.e. by melting a layer or the conductor which is deposited onto the substrate. Thus claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are clearly met by Choi et al. As to claims 8 and 11, it is invariable that some prior to alignment nanotubes will become loosely adhered at one or more points and that the electrostatic field will cause one of the bonds to break. As to claims 12, 14, 15 and 17-19, Choi, figure 17 illustrates the claimed steps of forming a field emission display.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. Choi differs from these claims in that the claimed aspect ratio is not disclosed. However, Choi is directed to substantially the same subject matter and the process of selecting an operable or optimum parameter for a range value has been held by the courts, absent evidence to the contrary, to merely involve an obvious engineering step when the general conditions of the process are otherwise substantially taught. See MPEP 2144.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9, 10, 13 and 16 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 9 and 10 are allowed since the specific steps of breaking the bond between the second end of the emitters of claim 8 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Claim 13 is allowed since the step of placing a second conductive region comprising an optically transparent insulator which is coated with indium tin oxide and using the same to orient the emitters as claimed in claim 12 is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Claim 16 is allowed since although Choi teaches using a laser to trim the lengths of the nanotubes, the step of trimming the lengths is subsequent to the step of orienting the nanotubes and not as part of the orienting step.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Kenneth Ramsey at telephone number 703-308-2324.

Kenneth J. Ramsey
KENNETH J. RAMSEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER